Chapter 2

Landlords and Tenants

The Estates: Drumheada and Corrodownan 1600 - 1700

The power structures which came into place in the townlands in the aftermath of the plantation caused lasting transformation in landholding and land settlement. At the apex of this power structure, was the landlord who consolidated his position right through the 18th century and into the first half of the 19th century. The instrument used by the landlord as an agent of change was the lease. In this document he expressed his concern for his property and his hopes to transform the landscape to enclosed 'civility'.

In order to explore the relationship between landlord and tenant in the townlands under review, it is necessary to examine the lease as the legal instrument by which the landlord negotiated with his tenant. The lease at all times, reflected the care of the landlord for his property and it offered certain rights to the tenant provided its covenants were fulfilled. The concerns of both landlord and tenant changed over time and it is important to trace the phases of this relationship. It is also necessary to explore the vexed questions of Ulster 'tenant right' and to see how this custom evolved and how it was applied to the townlands under review. Finally, the attitudes and mentalities of all the human interests, in the townlands, need to be examined in order to a come to a fuller understanding of these webs of relationships at local level.

The plantation plan of 1609 was formulated in order to bring 'civility' and Common Law to Ulster. The estates granted to undertakers were to be erected into manors based on a feudal system. The manors would be centres for local government and tenants would be obliged to do jury service at the manor courts. However, while this manorial system was being introduced, traditional feudal systems of land tenure were falling into disuse in England.[1] Therefore, when the land was granted to the undertakers from the King, they received it in 'Common Socage'.[2] This type of tenure eliminated ancient feudal services and left the new landlords with greater flexibility in negotiating leases with their tenants. The undertakers were instructed to give the following leases to their tenants. 'Fower fee furmors to be made ..., to be settled each upon 120 acres apeece; six leaseholders, for 3 lives or 21 yeares; to be settled every of them upon 100 acres apeece'.[3] The 1622 Survey of Drumheada and Corrodownan indicate that ostensibly these conditions were being fulfilled. When the surveyors arrived on the Corrodownan estate, nineteen men who were able to bear arms presented themselves.[4] Archibald Acheson claimed he had granted leases to his tenants as did James Craig of Drumheada. However, whether leases were actually granted to these tenants is questionable. For example, in the case of Sir James Craig, the surveyors stated: 'Most of these leases have not been perfected, but promises of short notes under Sir James, his hand'.[5] At Corrodownan where the settlers were stated to be of mixed British descent the English had been badly treated and put out of their estates because they

had set their lands to the Irish even though in 1622 that was the general practice in both estates.[6]

It is probable that economic necessity informed the behaviour of these two undertakers and gave them the incentive to let to the native Irish. Craig had purchased the two estates from the Auchmootie brothers and so did not have the advantages of a free grant of land. By 1637 Acheson had to mortgage Corrodownan to Martin Basil for £2,000.[7] That the British tenants also suffered hardship is reflected in the surveyors' report. 'They did complaine to us ... that their rents [are] soe great as they are not able to doe services at Assizes and sessions, wherein they pray to be relieved'[8]. The objections of the tenants were related to their being obliged to pay silver, normally 6[d], to the Lord of the Manor Court where they did jury service.[9]

Although the early years of the settlement was a period of difficulty for both landlords and tenants, nevertheless the plantation of Ulster redefined land law in Ireland and defined the method by which the landlord was to negotiate with his tenant and the lease was the written document which spelled out that relationship. Seventeenth-century leases, scant as they are for the area under study, offer a glimpse of the mentality and concerns of these landlords who were trying to tame a 'frontier' territory. One useful example is a lease issued by Patrick Acheson in July 1637. He leased a mill and the two townlands of Tycusker and Corhanagh in Corrodownan to John Gardner for 21 years.[10] The new tenant was instructed to do service at the manor court. The mill was to be renovated and all tenants would grind their corn there. John Gardner was expected to provide 'English Style' houses for

British tenants. As Acheson lived on his other estate in Armagh he was depending on strong tenants to initiate a village of sorts. Gardner was allowed to cut the landlord's timber for building and he was allowed to cut under-wood for 'carteboote and ploughboote'. The landlord was also concerned with enclosing the townlands in order to avoid land disputes and Gardner was expected to make forty perches of ditch per year 'sett with quicksetts'. He was also instructed to plant orchards and to plant ash, oak and elm trees on the lands and ditches. Finally, for the defence of the plantation, he was instructed to appear at all musters, armed with pike and musket. The landlord retained all hunting and fishing rights on the townlands. Gardner would forfeit his lands if he sub-let to the 'mere' Irish. The rent for the two townlands was £34 per year.[11]

The scant seventeenth-century evidence for Drumheada and Corrodownan can be complemented by a surviving lease for the neighbouring Hamilton estate of Clonkine and Carrotubber.[12] In 1663 James Young, a farmer who lived at Cormore received a fee farm grant of 92 acres and 32 acres respectively in the neighbouring townlands of Colebawn and Dromore. Young, in consideration of £20 and a rent of 5/- per acre per annum was granted possession of the land and his heirs could be assured of this possession forever, provided the annual rent was paid. Young was asked to give a heriot (fine) of his best cow on the death of every free tenant. He was to repair the mill and provide one armed man, either 'English or Ireland Scottish' to defend the premises. This type of lease, known as a fee farm grant, reflects the landlord's need for ready cash and his desire to be assured

of a fixed income from the two townlands. It also indicates his concern with establishing reliable and solvent tenants on his property who would have the financial ability to undertake improvements. However, in so doing the landlord forfeited future control of his land for himself and his heirs. Young represents the substantial townland or multiple townland *rentier* who would dominate land transactions in the area in the 18th century. He belonged to a prosperous yeoman class who benefited from the availability of land in the aftermath of the wars of the 17th century.

The prosperity of this class in the 18th century is reflected in the scant wills and leases available for this period. For example, the will of Arthur Beatty of Farranseer in the Parish of Killeshandra provides an insight into the life experiences, the concerns and the priorities of such a 'gentlemen'. Arthur Beatty willed to his son William Beatty 'various things including the oval table I brought out of Co. Longford'.[13] His other son, John, however was excluded from his father's will because 'he hath been disobedient and behaved in such a manner as he is not entitled to my favour'. Beatty's will implies a concern for his social standing which is expressed in his material possessions and the conformity of his family to social norms. It also reflects the mobility of this class who as a result of land transactions spread themselves into the neighbouring counties of Longford and Leitrim.

The lease to James Young of Cormore reveals that in the seventeenth century in the two estates under review, the relationship between landlord and tenant was dominated by two factors: firstly, a shortage of capital and secondly, a shortage of solvent reliable Protestant tenants. Therefore, the

landlords let their land under generous conditions to yeomen farmers in order to have it improved and in order to acquire a fixed income for the future. It can be observed from the rents charged that land values in this part of Ulster were very low and this concurs with Sir William Petty's opinion which stated that land in Ulster was worth 4/- an acre in 1642.[14] This compares very unfavourably with Leinster at 12/- an acre, Munster at 9/- an acre, and Connaught at 6/- an acre. Allowing for the devastation and waste of the 1641 rebellion, it is clear from these figures that much work had to be done by 1663 in order to bring land in the area to any kind of productivity and for the plantation to make an impact on the landscape.

The Estates: Drumheada and Corrodownan 1700 - 1750

Despite the difficulties of the seventeenth century, the Achesons eschewed the issuing of fee farm grants in Corrodownan and so maintained a compact estate. In contrast, it is obvious that the first three decades of the eighteenth century had been financially disastrous for Sir Robert Craig. It is likely that financial difficulties were compounded by adverse harvests in 1726. In 1726 he owed £19,320 -2-7 on his twin estates of Drumheada and Killagh.[15] By 1730 his property had passed into the hands of Sir John Carmichael of Skirline in Scotland.[16] When Sir John Carmichael took over the running of the estate, several fee farm grants had been issued on the Killagh property in the parish of Kildallen but Drumheada in Killeshandra parish was also affected.[17] The townland of Drummany had been leased as a fee farm in 1668. Drumhart, Tully and Corrydaren were also held 'in fee' by 1730.[18]

When William Starrat reviewed the estate for Sir. John Carmichael in 1732 he stated that he had annexed 'a description giving an account of each farm'.[19] The only farm that had been partitioned was Portlongfield and that was in four divisions. There are no leases extant for Drumheada in the first half of the eighteenth century but what exists for the sister estate in the parish of Kildallen probably reflects Carmichael's policy at that time. The records for this estate indicate that Sir John Carmichael leased land in townlands and more rarely in multiple townlands to substantial Protestant tenants. For example, in 1730 he leased the two townlands of Keilagh and Drumbennis in Kildallen parish containing 164 acres to John Faris of Makive. The rent was £32 per annum or approximately 4/- per acre.[20] The townlands of Aghnacreevy and Drumlara were leased to Walter Hinds, Faris's son-in-law for £38 per annum.[21] It can be concluded that the policy followed by the Carmichael family from 1732 to 1750 was to lease land in townlands to substantial Protestant tenants as had been the practice of their predecessor Sir Robert Craig in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century. However, Sir John Carmichael avoided further fragmentation of the estate and he did not issue any further fee farm grants. Between 1700 and 1750, it is clear that the chief tenant was the important factor in landlord-tenant relationships and the more numerous under-tenants on the townlands and the rents extracted from them remain unrecorded. To the extent that the chief tenant was the intermediary between landlord and tenant he could be regarded as a 'middleman'. However, these chief tenants lived in their townlands and improved their property. In that sense, they cannot be compared with the

multi-townland speculator of the grazier counties, so maligned by agricultural writers such as Arthur Young.

The Townlands: 1750 - 1800

Landlord Tenant relationships on the Corrodownan estate in the latter half of the eighteenth century can be explored by examining leases for those of its townlands which are under review namely Brankill, Corlesbratten, Castlepoles and Corrodownan.

In 1759, Francis and Thomas Armstrong and Thomas Morrison leased 60 acres in Corlesbratten for £11-8-9 per annum or approximately 4/- per acre. The lease was for three lives named in the lease.[22] In 1761 Elizabeth Moneypenny, widow, leased 94 acres in the same townland for £24-7-8 or 4/- per acre.[23] The details of Mrs. Moneypenny's lease in 1761 are informative and reflect the landlord's concerns and the tax burdens that had accumulated over the years. Again, the lease was for three lives named in the lease. Mrs. Moneypenny was required to pay hearth tax, church dues, and parish dues. She was instructed to keep all houses, buildings, ditches, drains and quick sets in good repair. She was instructed to ditch her farm 'as far as her mearings run' and to divide her farm into convenient fields with ditches sufficient'. She was also expected to plant quick sets or crab trees in the face of ditches. She had to grind her corn at the landlord's mill and her 'heirs, undertenants and cotters inhabiting or to inhabit would be obliged to suit serve at leet courts twice yearly'. Finally, tenants which her landlord, Lord Gosford would appoint, would be free to cut turf on her land 'without let or hindrance'. Mrs. Moneypenny's lease represents what was the norm for the

estate of Corodownan in the second half of the eighteenth century. She was still regarded as a chief tenant and it was accepted that her farm would be occupied by undertenants and cottiers.

Sub-letting was taken for granted in 1761 but with changing demographic circumstances, the landlords' attitude to under-tenants and cottiers would change over time. That Corlesbratten had been partitioned prior to 1761 is obvious from the phrase in Mrs. Moneypenny's lease which states that the lease was 'for that land in her actual possession'. This is a significant development and reflects a movement away from single townland lettings on the Corodownan estate prior to 1761.

In the townland of Castlepoles in 1776 the Hewitt brothers were leased 81 acres for three lives named in the lease.[24] The rental was £24 or 6/- per acre per annum. This lease reflects an upward movement in rents over a 15 year period but it indicates that the landlord was still leasing reasonably large acreages of land to substantial tenants as late as 1776.

Corlesbratten was again leased in 1781.[25] 'Half the townland of Corlesbratten consisting of 104 acres' was leased to Alexander Sutton at a rent of £40 per annum or 8/- per acre per annum. In 1761 rent had been 4/- per acre in Corlespratten so this represents an increase of 100 per cent in 20 years. By 1781, Mrs. Moneypenny's share of the townland had fallen to 44 acres indicating perhaps that she had relinquished part of her lease as she had been granted a lease of three lives in 1761.[26]

Lord Farnham among his other acquisitions initiated the purchase of the Carmichael property in 1765 and thus Drumheada came into his

possession.[27] Leases on this estate appear to have been renewed in several townlands in 1798. These new leases reflect spiralling rentals for the townlands which are under review in the Drumheada property namely Derrylane, Drumbullion, Portlongfield and Sallaghan..

Hugh Mulvey's lease in Derrylane is a relevant case.[28] In 1798, Mulvey was paying Lord Farnham £6-8-1½ per annum for 6 acres which included 2 acres of cut-away bog. This is approximately 20/- per acre at the turn of the century. Hugh Mulvey's lease was for three lives. The rent was payable half yearly on the 1st May and 1st November. The landlord expected 'one pounds of linen yarn' over and above rent and 8^{d} in the pound receiver's fees each year.

Again, several conditions were laid down by the landlord, namely to build a good house, make ditches and mearings around his farm. He had to plant orchards. At the end of the lease, Hugh Mulvey was expected to hand up his lease peacefully. In the leases for these townlands Lord Farnham spelled out what he perceived to be the landlord's rights on expiry of a lease and the tenant's right to a renewal of his lease was by no means taken for granted in 1798. Hugh Mulvey's lease reflects the strong position of the landlord who could now strike a hard bargain.

These increasing rents, the harsher strictures in the leases, and the landlord's demand for linen yarn reflect the major social and economic changes which had occurred in this part of Co. Cavan in the last three decades of the eighteenth century. An increasing population, a hunger for land and an ability to pay were the key causes of these very high rents. The

Killeshandra area had responded dramatically to incentives given by the Linen Board in 1761 to stimulate the growing of flax and the weaving of linen. Robert Stephenson had toured the area in 1760 on behalf of the Linen Board. Killeshandra, he said, had a tradition of 'a little linen weaving ... in the manufacture of 7-8 ths'.[29] This was sold at a weekly market in Killeshandra. A man named Kerr owned a bleachgreen in the town 'who buys and bleaches for himself'. Therefore, by 1761 a little had been done at local level to promote the industry.

In 1761, Stephenson visited Killeshandra for the second time. He stated that the linen industry would improve the lot of the people 'with the employment of men neglected, their yarn exported, and a fine country, that appears to have been formerly improved and inhabited, falling into desolation and waste'.[30]

It would appear from Robert Stephenson's remark, that Killeshandra had not recovered from the effects of the famine which had struck Ireland in 1740. A severe frost in February of that year resulted in the loss of the potato crop. Hunger, dysentery and disease followed. Ireland lost 250,000 people as a result of this famine and it lived on in the memory of the people as 'blian an áir' (the year of the slaughter).[31] R.A. Twiss commenting on food prices in the Lough Erne district in 1776 stated that potatoes at 1/- a barrel were extremely cheap but he remarked that potatoes had been 32/- a barrel in that area in 1740, a reflection of the great dearth of food.[32] Generally Parish registers offer a partial glimpse of the population in any area at this period because they only cover the Protestant denomination. However, the Register

for Killeshandra parish remains a useful guide to demographic data. In the two years preceding the famine of 1740, the average number of deaths for the Protestant parish was 8. In 1740 however, 40 persons were buried, 17 girls, 16 boys and 7 married women. Thus we get a small insight into what happened in the townlands in that devastating year. It is perhaps significant that while 7 married women died, no deaths were recorded for adult males. Women who were involved in caring for families were probably more exposed to fever and other such epidemics. In that year the McDowells of Portlongfield lost a daughter, the Davises of Derrylane lost a son and the Loves of Castlepoles also lost a son.[33] The havoc wrought among the poorer Catholic population is not recorded.

The incentives given by the Linen Board helped develop the industry in Killeshandra. Within 20 years, the parish had developed a thriving linen industry and by 1783 Killeshandra had become an important coarse linen market with 15,600 webs per annum being sold there.[34] By 1803 the number had doubled to 31,200. 1803 was the peak year for Killeshandra and thereafter the sales of linen began to decline. Arva the town on the Corrodownan estate also participated in the prosperity. By 1803 Arva was selling 31,200 webs, the same amount as Killeshandra. Arva outstripped Killeshandra between 1803 and 1820. After 1816, the sale of linen declined and by 1836 was 'quite at an end' in the parish.[35]

For a period of 50 years, Killeshandra parish benefited from this thriving linen industry. Flax growing and linen weaving took priority over agricultural production. In 1801, Coote remarked about Killeshandra 'they

cultivate no more provisions than they require for themselves, their great concern is flax, husbandry and the linen manufacture'.[36] Pigot's Directory in 1824 stated of Killeshandra 'the inhabitants of the town and neighbourhood are principally employed in the manufacture of linen'.

Evidence given before the Select Committee into the Co. Cavan election of 1783 reflect the life experiences and major preoccupations of some of the tenantry in the townlands towards the end of the 18th century.[37] Lord Farnham, who had been defeated in the election called an enquiry alleging bribery and corruption on the part of his opponent Montgomery. Leaseholders who were entitled to vote (freeholders) gave evidence in this case. The evidence furnished to the Select Committee by the Ellis brothers of Sallaghan provides a window on the world of the tenant farmers in the 18th century. The evidence of William Ellis is instructive. William Ellis's horizons were not confined to his own townland. As a freeholder, he was accustomed to voting and attending the session house in Cavan. He was not unfamiliar with the inns and hostelries of Cavan town. He knew a wide range of people including John Faris from the parish of Kildallen 'a respectable gentleman in the county'. His travels also brought him outside the county to the fairs in Armagh where he happened to meet Mr. Faris. In his political manoeuvring, he had taken a bribe organised by Faris and voted against his landlord, Lord Farnham. He therefore 'feared losing his turf bank', which he held 'at Lord Farnham's pleasure'. In spite of his mobility and seeming independence his ability to fend for his family was curtailed by power structures at home.

Holding the turf bank 'at Lord Farnham's pleasure' was one way of keeping him dependant on his landlord.

William's brother Arthur had voted for his landlord and hoped through Lord Farnham's influence to acquire a linen seal. A linen seal guaranteed quality and was a valuable asset to any weaver or linen jobber. By 1783, leases were difficult to acquire and other evidence in this enquiry indicated that the greatest reward for impersonation would be a 'lease for three lives'.[38]

Thus when Coote made his statistical survey of the barony of Tullyhunco in 1801 he declared, 'Population is very considerable, and the linen manufacture more engaged in by the market in Killeshandra where coarse linens are purchased every week to the average value of £1,500'.[39] That the relationship between landlord and tenant had responded to changed economic and social circumstances is reflected in Coote's remark 'Formerly the landlord fought for a tenant to take his ground on a long lease ... but now there is no want of bidders for farms at considerably a higher rent more than their value'.[40] Coote regarded the small farmer engaged in the manufacture of linen as a middleman who employed journey men [weavers]. 'He rents land at from 15/- to 30/- per acre ... this he divides into so many parts ... he sets a rood of ground for 50/- which is ten pounds an acre'.[41] These figures may have been exaggerated but it is clear that the townland chief tenant and the under-tenant-turned-manufacture all participated in this prosperity but as long as old leases were in place the landlords were helpless to act.

When leases were renewed on the Drumheada estate in 1798, Lord Farnham raised the rents to £1 per acre.[42] However, he did not hasten into the accelerated fragmentation of the townlands. Hugh Mulvey's lease for a small holding in Derrylane was exceptional. There were only two other tenants granted leases in that townland in 1798 and they were Charles Magee and Hugh Davis holding 50 acres and 44 acres respectively.

It can be observed that the evidence for the last half of the eighteenth century points to an increasing population in the area under review. It is clear that the linen industry was thriving and weaver farmers and under-tenants had money to spend. However, the leases issued in the townlands during the period 1750 - 1800 do not reflect this competition for land. Lord Farnham must have considered it a sounder policy to grant long leases at high rents to substantial tenants in order to maintain a 'respectable' Protestant tenantry than to rush into the fragmentation of townlands for short-term gain. It also indicates that the strong farmer in the townland was still in a competitive situation vis-à-vis the rising weaver under-tenant.

The leases on the Corrodownan estate for the latter half of the eighteenth century follow the same pattern but the last of the Corrodownan leases had been issued in 1781, a short time before the great upsurge in the linen industry had begun.

The Townlands - 1800 - 1820

Lord Farnham continued his policy of leasing to substantial tenants in the early years of the nineteenth century. In 1803 he leased 74 acres in Sallaghan to Thomas Clindinnin who was obviously in a position to bid for a

large acreage.[43] There is no record of his rental. An examination of the rent rolls for the Drumheada estate in 1820 indicates that Lord Farnham restricted the number of direct tenants on the townlands under review by his considered policy in 1798 and 1803.[44] In 1820 Drumbullion had only six direct tenants with average holdings of 22 acres, and Portlongfield in 1820 had only 12 direct tenants with average holdings of 30 acres. While these direct tenants were not the *rentiers* of half townlands, nevertheless their holdings were viable and could withstand the economic vicissitudes of the period.

In 1802, new leases were granted by the Earl of Gosford in Brankill and this townland reflects a different policy in estate management.[45] In Brankill, 18 small holders became direct tenants. The rent was approximately 25/- per acre per annum and unlike Lord Farnham's leases for three lives, the Gosford leases were reduced to one life or twenty one years. The average size of the holdings in Brankill was eleven acres. Just four tenants had holdings of approximately 15 acres.

By 1802 landholding in Brankill was in the hands of Protestant surnames and it appears this status quo was maintained until the 1840s. An incident in August 1835 reflects the outlook of the inhabitants of these segregated townlands. A letter from the Chief Constable at Arva to his superiors relates how several stacks of flax 'the property of James Mooney, a poor labouring man' had been destroyed.[46] A notice had been placed on that part of the land where the flax was sown advising Mooney to 'fly'.

You may come back with great alarm
But it is to yourselves you will do the harm
As John Doogan in the month of July
But in short Youse will have to fly
Now make haste and red the road
For there is one waiting for your abode.

According to the Chief Constable's information, the reason for the 'malicious act' was to deter a man of the name of John MacNulty who farmed the land on which the flax was sown 'from continuing in the occupancy of it, he being the only Roman Catholic in the Brankill Estate which is the property of Lord Gosford'. John Doogan is referred to in the notice because an ear had been cut of his donkey in the month of July. This was in retaliation for the fact that the donkey had had orange lilies around its neck on the 12th of July in order to ridicule Orangemen taking part in the parades.[47]

The attitudes, the fears, the concerns of some of the local Protestant community towards their Catholic neighbours is reflected in the many lampoons, notices and poems which were despatched to Catholics by various means. For example:

But all their efforts will truly fail
On our Orange banner to prevail
It's not the year of forty one
When Youse murdered Orange men
But we have got the rise again
And Orangemen will rule the plain
So now you Croppies take great care
When ere you come to Arva fair ...[48]

The 1840's saw no abatement in sectarian animosity Catholics stole guns from Protestant households and were accused by Protestants of being members of the 'Molly Maguires', a group of agrarian terrorists. On the 8th August 1847 Edward Sheridan of Castlepoles was accused of robbing William Lang of Castlepoles and John Mills of Drumhillagh of their guns.[49] The 'memorialist' William Lang of Castlepoles stated he was a small farmer and an aged man. He had served in the Crossdoney Corps of the Yeomanry for upwards of 31 years and that the arms were left to him by the Government. He claimed he was taken from his bed by an armed party of 'midnight legislators' that the musket which he had carried 'so long with credit to himself' was taken from him. He accused thieves of having committed 'many murders and robberies ... and having spread terror and alarm through the country'. The memorialist being poor needed expenses.

It is little wonder then that fairs and markets became scenes of sectarian pitched battles in the 19th century and that when the Orange drums assembled in such places as Derrylane, there was always the probability that a riot would ensue.

The ethno-religious status quo was also maintained in Castlepoles but Catholics and Protestants had had to accommodate to each other in that townland from the time of the plantation. In 1784, the four direct tenants in Castlepoles were John Roberts, the two Hewitt brothers, the two O'Reilly brothers and John Masterson and partners[50]. In 1802 Masterson's partners received direct leases which added five new tenants to the rent roll.[51] The holdings however remained relatively large at 23 acres each. At a time of

expanding population and a thriving linen industry it can be assumed that there were many under tenants in this townland. Perhaps these under tenants were not in a position to bid for leases or the landlord may have been reluctant to initiate negotiations with a numerous Catholic under-tenantry.

In 1802 the new leases on the Gosford estate contained the usual mandatory clauses and the tenants were still being instructed to mear and ditch their farms. However, the landlord's worries about increasing pauperisation on his estates is reflected in a new clause inserted in the leases. William Armstrong's lease for seven acres of land in Brankill illustrates this point.[52] Armstrong was instructed 'neither to sell, demise, alien mortgage or dispose of the said premises or any part thereof without consent' [of the landlord]. In 1801 Coote considered it virtually impossible 'to devise a means of carrying this desirable clause into effect'.[53] In 1802 Gosford threatened to impose an extra £1-10-0 on the annual rent if conditions were not fulfilled. Armstrong would rent his land from the 1st November 1802 and pay his rent in half yearly instalments. Coote remarked 'One half of the yearly rents of Cavan are left with the tenants to trade on as they pay only the last gale as the second becomes due'.[54] This practice meant that the tenant always owed the landlord six month's rent and thus had a 'gale' hanging over him at all times and left him in a vulnerable position with the landlord.

Gosford's increasing rent rolls were curtailed somewhat in 1816 when virtually all his tenants who had been granted leases in 1802 were found to be in arrears.[55] In Brankill all tenants were in this situation some for trifling amounts, others owed a half year's rent while the most severe case owed

£33-12-4 or four years rent. The picture is almost the same for Castlepoles. The only 1802 lessee to stay out of arrears in Castlepoles was John Masterson who had a holding of 13 acres. The Hewitts and John Roberts who held old leases granted in 1776 were advantaged with low rents of 6/- per acre and were not in difficulty.

In 1817 Corlesbratten still had three chief tenants, the Armstrongs, the Moneypennys and the Suttons. They also had the benefits of old leases and were not on the arrears list. In 1817, Corrodownan still had nine direct tenants, the largest of whom was William Masterson with 62 acres. James Kemp had twenty acres and the rest of the tenants had small holdings ranging from eight to twelve acres. Judging by their rentals, it is evident that their leases were also granted in 1802 and by 1817 all the tenants were also in arrears.

It is obvious that this crisis for the 1802 lessees was precipitated by the cessation of the Napoleonic War in 1815. In 1816 the linen industry was waning but was still worth £3,000 per week to the parish of Killeshandra. It would seem that the collapse in agricultural prices affected all these farmers and prevented them from paying the high rents which they had sustained since 1802. The area was also hit by the failure of the potato crop in 1816 and these circumstances led to much distress and hardship. There is evidence however, that Lord Gosford responded to their distress by reducing rents by as much as 25 per cent in May 1818.[56]

William Blacker, an agriculturist and agent for Lord Gosford involved himself in helping the tenants survive the crisis. All persons who had taken

out leases in 1802 were given clover seed gratis.[57] They were helped with ground limestone to fertilise their farms. Blacker exhorted then to 'lay the lime on top of the ridges before moulding and not to let it touch the manure'. An enthusiastic improver, Blacker did not spend any time on the Cavan estate but nevertheless he became proactive in the development of better farming methods and these instructions he relayed to appointees on the Cavan estate. He believed that small holdings were viable and desirable propositions. Perhaps this is why he stated in 1817 'There is no use in giving Foster [of Brankill] a larger property ... this year'.[58]

The period 1800 to 1820 witnessed a boom and bust pattern in the economic situation in the townlands. This was a reflection of the agricultural adjustment which had taken place in Ireland as a result of the end of the Napoleonic War. It is clear from the records that are available that the tenants on the Corrodownan estate suffered the most financial distress and a crisis arose on the estate in 1816 - 1817. Only in the townlands of Corlesbratten and in Castlepoles, where old leases were still unexpired, did the direct tenants avoid a crisis. It can be concluded that the policy of direct letting to numerous under-tenants had worked to Lord Gosford's disadvantage by 1817 when he was forced to give a substantial abatement in rent to help tenants out of difficulty.[59] On the larger farms of the Farnham estate it would seem probable that these farmers were better able to weather the crisis. However, the paucity of records for the Farnham estate in this period leaves that question largely unanswered.

In conclusion, the leases of the period reflect the expanding land-less population and the landlords' anxieties to avoid 'pauperisation' of the townlands.

The Townlands 1820 - 1846

The direct tenants in Corlesbratten were fortunate in having the advantages of long leases and low rents right through the first two decades of the nineteenth century. However, how the under-tenantry fared under these chief tenants is unrecorded. In 1825, leases for Corlesbratten expired and for the first time, English statute measure was used in the leases.[60] These new agreements were for 21 years. John Morrow for example, was granted a lease of five acres English measure, or approximately three acres Irish at a rent of £3-16-8 per annum.[61] Apart from the usual clauses in the lease, he was obliged to give Lord Gosford 'two days work of man cart and horse each year'. Morrow's rent reflects no real increase on the rentals of 1802. It is a barometer for the economic situation in the Killeshandra area in a period declining agricultural prices.[62] William Magee and James Naylor were the most substantial farmers with holdings of 37 acres and 23 acres respectively. The other 11 landholders had an average of 13 acres each.

Four new direct tenants had been added to Casltepoles since 1802 and in 1827 a total of 13 was recorded.[63] John Masterson was still the largest landholder with a farm of 40 acres. The farms in Castlepoles in 1829 averaged about 19 acres. In 1827 Brankill had 19 direct tenants, an addition of 1 since 1802. Corrodownan had one extra direct tenant since 1802 and had just 10 direct tenants in 1827.

The early years of the 19th century brought an added dimension to Corlespratten and other townlands in the area in the form of a 'flaming spiritual revival'. This revival was spearheaded by the General Missionaries of the Irish Methodist Conference. In 1778 a Methodist Church had been established at Drumbullion but the arrival of Gideon Ouseley and Charles Graham, two Methodist Preachers, in 1801 was the catalyst for a new spiritual awakening.[64] On the 22nd May 1801, the missionaries preached to a 'great crowd' in the market at Arva. On Saturday 24th may they preached to 'not less than a thousand people' in a field at Drumlarney. This field was offered to the missionaries by a substantial farmer named Harpur.[65]

Some idea of the drama of this spiritual revival which was taking place among the people can be gleaned from C. H. Crookshanks description of events in the townlands. 'On Sunday May 24th, they preached to not less than a thousand persons, all of whom appeared much affected, and many were converted. In the evening at Drumbullion, the audience was even larger, and ... manifestations of saving power were numerous'.[66]

In the 1820's, Gideon Ouseley cut an unusual figure in the rural towns and he always gained the attention of the people. The following description provides a glimpse of this energetic missionary. 'About noon a stranger rode on horseback into the market-place, a man not beyond middle age, but of grave and noble aspect. He was dressed in black, with long black gaiters, and a velvet cap on his head'.[67]

However, the presence of the Methodist missionaries in the area did not always have harmonious results. For example, on the 30th October 1823, a

market day, Gideon Ouseley preached at Killeshandra. Subsequent events, as described by Ensign George Edgelow, in a letter to headquarters, reflect the cultural and religious divides which were being exacerbated by the presence of Mr. Ouseley.[68] 'Scarcely had he ended when a voice from the crowd called out, "I'll down you for a false prophet", and immediately a fight ensued. The Military were turned out and succeeded in dispersing the mob'. Several such incidents occurred in the towns of Killeshandra and Arva during this period of religious revival.

While causing acrimony and sectarian bitterness in the market place, the Methodist ministry had the effect of unifying certain communities in this common form of dissenting worship. This was particularly so in the townland of Corlespratten where a new church was built in 1803. The people of Corlespratten defied the opposition of Dr. Hales, a fellow of Trinity College and Rector of Killeshandra in order to participate in this more congregation centred form of worship.[69] The people must have found in Methodism and in its egalitarian approach a refuge from the trials of daily life and a more satisfying spiritual experience. Meetings were held in each other's homes, simple meals called 'love feasts' were partaken of with drinks passed around in two handled mugs, all symbolic ways of uniting the Methodist community.[70] It is difficult to assess why the people of Corlespratten embraced Methodism so enthusiastically and why the people of Brankill did not. Corlespratten and Brankill were contiguous highly fragmented Protestant townlands. Both were in the estate of the absentee landlord, Gosford, and both were far removed from landlord control. An examination

of the occupations for persons in the 8 townlands under review may offer part of the answer.

Table 9

Townland	Weavers	Farmers
Sallaghan	4	8
Portlongfield	2	22
Derrylane	3	5
Drumbullion	7	10
Corlespratten	17	21
Brankill	7	22
Castlepoles	3	23
Cordownan	2	12

Source: 1841 Census Killeshandra Parish

In 1841, the residue of the linen industry was reflected in the number of persons in each townland who declared themselves to be weavers. Corlespratten has by far the highest number of weavers in relation to farmers than any of the other townlands.

Table 9 demonstrates that the strong farmers, like those of Portlongfoeld, did not get involved in weaving to any great extent. It could be argued that Methodism found a willing audience among the 'plainer sort of people' the independent weavers, than it did in the more substantial and conservative circles of the strong farmers.

Reminiscing about Corlespratten, Fullerton wrote 'Corlespratten was a fine district: it was a delight to visit there. I think of the Doonans, the Cookes, the Wilsons, the Magees, the Storeys, the Johnstons of Drumcrow and Robert Green of precious memory'.[71]

The influence of Methodism, this deeply felt religion, in people's lives, is reflected in the biblical language used without affectation. A land-lady welcoming a new preacher to Corlespratten wryly commented 'Aye another king arose who knew not Joseph; many a preacher I kept, but another king arose'.[72]

The spiritual upheavals which took place between 1800 and 1820 were accompanied by serious economic decline in the townlands. This economic uncertainty is reflected in a new type of tenancy, the tenancy 'at will'. This tenancy could continue indefinitely but was determinable by either party at any time.[73] By 1846, virtually all leases on the Corrodownan estate were 'at will'.[74] A few old three lives leases had not fallen in but all the 1802 leases had expired and it is clear from the records that these leases were not renewed. Between 1827 and 1846 Brankill had acquired four new direct tenants, Castlepoles four, and Corrodownan five. On the other hand, Corlesbratten's direct tenants had jumped from fifteen in 1827 to 33 in 1846. However, one widow holding one acre was included in the estate rental as were six cottiers holding one rood and 21 perches each. In real terms the number of direct tenants in Corlesbratten had increased by eleven in nineteen years. The fact that the landlord had the cottiers on his rent roll reflects an effort to control cottier occupation of the townlands. Why Lord Gosford had changed his leasing policy is not recorded. Evidence given to the Devon Commission in Co. Cavan, indicated that tenants were unwilling to take long leases at high rents.[75] However, the rents on the Corrodownan estate at approximately 15/- per English acre were not by any means high. It is

probable that the arrangement suited both landlord and tenant as neither of them were locked into any binding agreement in the uncertain economic climate.

It can be concluded from the evidence examined that Lord Gosford began to become involved in negotiating directly with the under-tenantry in 1802. Brankill and part of Castlepoles and Corrodownan were first rationalised. It was not until old leases expired in Corlesbratten that the under-tenantry of this townland appeared in the rent books. By 1827 it is obvious that a numerous under-tenantry already occupied this townland and the accelerated growth of the population in the townland can be traced up to 1846.

In spite of the best efforts of William Blacker to improve agricultural methods, all the tenants of the Cavan Estate in 1846 declared that they could not pay their rent. In January 1847, William Blacker wrote to the agricultural instructor, Fyfe at Arva.[76] He said that Lord Gosford was of the opinion 'that a combination was entered into not to pay rent which he considers a most ungrateful return for the expenditure he has been at and the assistance given upon the Cavan Estate'. This 'combination' reflects the willingness of both Protestants and Catholics to co-operate when circumstances required. It also reflects a new political awareness among the tenantry. They now expected the landlord to behave 'morally' towards them instead of putting his financial interests first. When Lord Gosford mentioned 'expenditure' and 'assistance', he was referring to the numerous subsidies and schemes that he had encouraged in order to improve agriculture during the previous ten

years. Seeds were being distributed among the tenantry. This venture was intended to encourage them to grow green crops, particularly turnips. Blacker fulminated at an ungrateful tenantry and declared that any person holding fifteen acres 'should have as much to take to market as would have sufficient'.

The fact that both Gosford and his agent rarely visited the district and left the running of the estate to an agricultural instructor made it all the easier for the tenants to 'combine' against him in periods of distress. Lord Farnham, a resident landlord, on the other hand appears to have had no difficulty with his tenants in the first year of the famine.[77]

A rental for the Farnham estate in 1820, records all the direct tenants for townlands under review on the Farnham estate.[78] In 1820, Derrylane had just three direct tenants: Hugh Mulvey, a smallholder, Charles Magee who held 50 acres and Hugh Davis who held 44 acres. The direct tenants in Drumbullion had average holdings of 22 acres and they numbered just six: the Harknesses, the Jacksons, the Ruddens, the Hixes, the Reynolds, and Margaret Ormston. Portlongfield had average holdings of thirty acres each. There were twelve direct tenants which included four Bleakleys. Sallaghan had 13 direct tenants with an average holding of nine acres each. This was an exceptionally fragmented townland for the Farnham estate. The explanation again appears to lie in the fact that Lord Farnham had leased most of this townland to Thomas Clindinnin as late as 1803.[79]

By the time this lease expired an under-tenantry of small holders had developed who were able to bid for leases when Clindinnin disengaged from

the townland.[80] The evidence for Sallaghan and Corlesbratten suggests that the later intervention of the landlords in the rationalisation of these townlands left them with a more numerous under tenantry to cope with in the long run.

As the population grew, land became scarce and relations between landlord and tenant became exacerbated. The question of the Ulster custom or 'tenant right' occupied the minds of many tenants who were looking for what they considered was fair treatment from their landlord.

Tenant right grew up in Ulster in the peculiar circumstances of the 1609 plantation.[81] Substantial reliable tenants were difficult to find in the early days of the settlement. Because a lease represented an interest in property or in the unexpired period of the lease, it became currency and leases were easily traded in the early days of the plantation. With economic progress and development, the lease became even a more valuable asset. Lord Farnham in 1798, in his lease to Hugh Mulvey of Derrylane spelled out what rights Mulvey did not have. It was made very clear that Mulvey did not have the right of renewal over the expiry of the lease and he would be expected to leave the premises peacefully.[82] The right to renewal of the lease depended entirely on the wishes of the landlord.

However, the records show that in practice satisfactory tenants had their leases renewed on both Lord Gosford's and Lord Farnham's estate. An unsatisfactory tenant however, could not be assured of renewal. For example, the unfortunate occupant of Lord Farnham's gate-house was ejected in December 1832. He requested leave to stay until May but was refused by

Lord Farnham on the grounds that 'his wife is much too filthy a slattern to conduce me to comply with the request'.[83]

A letter from William Blacker, Lord Gosford's agent to John McAnulty of Brankill is informative about what the landlord considered to be the tenant's right.[84] John McAnulty was being ejected from his premises in Brankill. He was told by Blacker 'I caution you on behalf of his Lordship that he will not consider you for any tenant right in the place you have purchased on his estate if Mr. Mitchell is obliged to take proceedings'. However, if he complied with the landlord's wishes, he would be given 'an allowance of any permanent or fixed improvements you may have made in the house'.

What had evolved on these estates was the tenant right to sell his interest in a lease or in the improvements he had made on a farm. Thus, a farmer taking a new lease had to satisfy the landlord as to his suitability and he had to have enough capital to satisfy the outgoing tenant. The evidence of witnesses to the Devon Commission confirms the recognition of tenant right in many parts of Cavan and the capital expense involved in getting into a leasehold farm. Hugh Porter of Ballyjamesduff stated in his evidence to the Commission that he had paid £96 for the tenant right of twelve Irish acres in 1831.[85]

Much later, in January 1846, Alexander McDowell of Portlongfield asked Lord Farnham to buy the Boyd farm in the same townland.[86] Farnham approved but he already knew that Boyd was not prepared to sell to McDowell. On March 2nd, 1846, Robert Boyd, applied to Lord Farnham for permission to sell to Malcolm Ellis in preference to McDowell.[87] Lord

Farnham's reply is significant. 'I have no right to interfere and decline doing so as the tenants seem to have so great an objection to Andrew McDowell. I would recommend him to withdraw his claim. I cannot consent to giving a farm to one who is displeasing his neighbour'. So long as Lord Farnham approved of both applicants, the wishes of the outgoing tenants and neighbours took precedence.

Even under-tenants were given tenant rights on Lord Farnham's estate. For example, in October 1844, John McClean of Drumbullion who held a farm under Robert Reynolds asked permission to sell his farm to Andrew McCormick of Denmore. This was approved of by Lord Farnham. As John McClean did not have a lease, his tenant right lay in the key or the goodwill of the farm and in any improvements which he may have undertaken.[88]

In 1853 a letter from William Blacker, Lord Gosford's agent to a prospective tenant in the townland of Lacken makes clear what the custom was.[89] 'I have never known a tenant to be removed as long as he paid his rent and when unable to do so he has the liberty to sell his holding stipulating the right of the landlord to be satisfied as to the respectability and the solvency of the buyer and in every case the preference to be given to some of the adjoining tenants if he is able to give an honest and fair price for it'.

In exercising his prerogative to sell his tenant right, the tenant controlled to some extent the persons who would succeed him in the townland, provided that the new tenant satisfied the landlord. It can be argued therefore that the exercise of this privilege further segregated the

townlands because the tenant right was not really sold on the open market to the highest bidder.

Relationships between landlord and tenant in the area under review changed over time and responded to various surges and setbacks in the economy. They also responded to demographic pressures and overcrowding on townlands. The instrument that controlled and defined these relationships was the lease drawn up for both landlord and tenant. Leases combined with rent records from the landed estates give insights into how relationships and concerns changed over time and to see what part estate management played in the evolution of the townlands and their inhabitants.

It can also be observed that the custom of tenant right, as it was exercised in the townlands under review, contributed to harmonious relationship between landlord and tenant gave the tenant a sense of security and an interest in the improvement of his property. However, as demonstrated in the case of Brankill, it may also have contributed to total ethnic segregation in some townlands and encouraged religious animosity and confrontation.

In conclusion, the landlords consolidated their situation in the 18th and 19th centuries. The new settler tenants also became part of the fabric of society and maintained their places in the townlands until the 19th century. The continuity of their surnames in the townlands became an enduring feature of this period. Transformations took place in the townlands particularly in land ownership and landscape management. Ditches were

dug, houses were built and orchards planted and the townlands were at last brought to 'civility'.

Nevertheless the vestiges of the old material culture still remained. Despite landlord innovations, the parish of Killeshandra remained largely a wheel-less world where the ancient loy was the ultimate tool of husbandry. The thatched cabins of the peasantry were not innovative and owed little to landlord 'improvement'. These small native continuities remained within the larger process of settler consolidation.